

Oral (a) 11/12/02



William D. Euille
Member of Council

City of Alexandria, Virginia
301 King Street, Suite 2300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314



Office (703) 751-7970
Home (703) 836-2680
Fax (703) 751-8846
wdeuille@wdeuille.com

MEMO

To: Mayor & Council Members
Phil Sunderland, City Manager
Rich Baier, TE & S Director

From: Bill Euille *WDE*

Re: Duke-Eisenhower Connector

Date: November 1, 2002

Pursuant to our work session meeting on Tuesday, October 29, please find enclosed a copy of my proposed Comprehensive (& Integrated) Transportation Solutions "Action Plan" for your consideration and approval.

I believe we should incorporate most of this plan in the overall discussions and considerations for solutions which Council may ultimately approve, as I see an overall Transportation Master Plan as a must.

"Home Town of George Washington and Robert E. Lee"

October 23, 2002

Bill Euille's
Proposed
Comprehensive (& Integrated) Transportation Solutions
"Action Plan "

I want to see a plan that serves *all* the citizens and neighborhoods of Alexandria. I know that staff has done a wonderful job in getting us the best available information *specific to the Connector*, but I want to see a plan that is *City-wide*, comprehensive, integrated and takes into account:

- ⌚ Protection of Residential Neighborhoods;
- ⌚ Pedestrian safety;
- ⌚ Reduction of traffic volume & congestion;
- ⌚ *Encouragement of* mass transit use; and,
- ⌚ Arterial streets and key congestion points like Braddock Road, King Street, Duke Street and Quaker Lane.
- ⌚ Public Safety Access to Eisenhower Valley

We need something comprehensive in consultation with our experts and neighborhood associations. I just do not want to see the further splintering of our city into another pocket of disagreement and discord, when we have a unique opportunity to make a broad-base application of resources for the betterment of our entire city.

Listen, I know there has been discussion about a "*Transportation Policy*" and it has been somewhat tabled, but I feel it would be useful to take a look at or develop further a Transportation Management or Master Plan. A plan which removes the connector as a neighborhood issue, but addresses *traffic* concerns as city-wide in perspective and solution. And most importantly is in the best interest of the citizens and city of Alexandria as a whole.

To accomplish this, I need more information before we undertake this issue further. For example, I understand that there were studies scheduled which were not *yet* completed, *and others that have been carried out but not presented to us yet*. Perhaps we need to complete origin and destination studies, As well as perimeter and transportation analysis surveys. So, that we can have more information and a broader impact analysis. Understanding that we will not be able to solve everything. Some things are just systemic, but we can address these objectives and focus on:

- ⌚ Diverting and/or channeling through traffic around residential neighborhoods, and intercepting the traffic before it enters the city (mostly North and South traffic)
- ⌚ Collecting and localizing traffic and channeling it for quick and efficient discharge to perimeter arteries away from residential neighborhoods (mostly East and west). This can result result in reduced vehicle emissions and improved air quality.
- ⌚ Prioritizing local traffic improvements that reduce congestion and thus minimize cut-through traffic (i.e. adjustments to traffic signalization, traffic calming, street design, intersection management, reconfiguration of one-way streets) and making it difficult to use neighborhoods as shortcuts.
- ⌚ Reducing dependency on cars, especially for home to work trips, by better management practices, safer streets for pedestrians, better bicycle commuting options, etc.
- ⌚ Encouraging mass transportation use both for inter and intra city transportation (seeing where we need additional Metro stations, increased bus service (Dash route reconfiguration and expansion with connectivity to neighborhoods) and other transit measures, like light rail on Woodrow Wilson Bridge.
- ⌚ Economic Impacts
- ⌚ Land Use Plan in concert with Planning And Parks & Recreation Staffs

I believe this would require:

- ⌚ A better understanding of land use/transportation relationships and the consequences of our land use decisions and the relationship between amount of parking and availability of mass transit options and use of personal automobiles.
- ⌚ A city-wide perspective, not a piece meal or band-aid solution.
- ⌚ Creative solutions, recognizing that traffic pressures are all around us.
- ⌚ Commitment to the solutions with a buy-in from the neighborhoods,
- ⌚ Plan of action
- ⌚ Funding Commitment, and a
- ⌚ Implementation strategy

I believe we need to step back and seriously take a look and explore this issue in the context of traffic and pedestrian safety from a comprehensive and integrated perspective for a better Alexandria.

Oral(a)
11-12-02**ROUGH DRAFT****CITY COUNCIL OF ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA
Regular Meeting — November 12, 2002
Partial Verbatim
DOCKET ITEM ORAL (A)**

* * * * *

Oral Presentations (a).

Mayor: Let's go ahead and move to oral presentations. One of the things that I want to, to bring up before the Council tonight is a, a reaffirmation of, of the results of our work session on the, the Eisenhower-to-Duke Connector, although I know you didn't want to, you don't want us to call it a connector any longer. We decided by, by consensus at, at that work session that we were going to remove the, the four-lane options from consideration. We would no longer consider four-lane options. That we would remove from consideration as a package, no-build with improvements. That we would only give any further consideration to two-lane options, and we asked staff to, to look at, at potentially multiple locations for those two-lane options. And then I know the staff and, and the manager have been working on a scope of work and a time schedule as well. I think it's, since that, that decision was arrived at by consensus in a work session, I think it's important that we reaffirm that decision tonight in an open and recorded vote, and so, Mr. Speck,

Speck: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor: I'd like to ask that you go ahead and offer that, that motion.

Speck: Let me make a motion on, on several points. First, to make it clear what is being removed from further consideration. That is all four-lane options as well as the no-build with improvements as a package. That we will continue for study and analysis the two-lane roadway connections in multiple locations. Specific projects that were previously in the no-build with improvements that are deemed to be necessary for traffic improvement. These are things that would continue to be considered. Public safety access routes. As well as that the staff report back to the Council with recommendations for undertaking a comprehensive transportation plan for the entire Eisenhower Valley as reflected in the documents developed by Councilman Euille titled, "Comprehensive and Integrated Transportation Solutions Action Plan." There may be some other things that we want to talk about, but I think it's important to memorialize in a motion exactly what is not being considered and what is still part of, of our analysis and review.

Mayor: Let me just, let me just ask a question, a point of clarification. Well, let me, let me say that we've done a motion. Is there a second to the motion? It's been seconded by Mr. Euille. Just a point of clarification on, on your motion, Mr. Speck. The, you made reference to, to a plan of action that has been offered by, by Mr. Euille that I believe has, has a couple of long-term elements, and maybe I'll ask Mr. Euille to speak to it. Number one, it would have a land use, or at least a planning element for West Eisenhower.

Speck: Yes.

Mayor: And, and also the completion of the, the transportation policy. And I know that the Manager has, has reviewed Mr., Mr. Euille's proposal as well. Just a quick question to the Manager. I know that, that a lot of that work has been ongoing and would be, this is obviously a more comprehensive look both at the land use and the transportation elements of, of not only the, the Eisenhower West area but also the, the connectors. The two-lane roadways. Let me put it that way. How long do you believe that such a process would, would take, and, and I'm assuming that what's envisioned is a similar process to what went on in the East Eisenhower area.

Manager: Let, let me distinguish between two things. One is a land use kind of small area study for Eisenhower West that would have a traffic transportation transit component to it just like Eisenhower East. So it would be looking at the development potential, the future of Eisenhower West, and in defining what that future is, there would be a transportation analysis done with it. That is something that is, as we have it scheduled now, is to begin, I think, sometime in the latter part of '03. Remember, we have Eisenhower East too, and that's a planning and zoning arena, although obviously to the extent it's transportation, it involves T&ES as well. We have Eisenhower East scheduled to hopefully get wrapped up at the end of this year. We then have Mount Vernon Avenue we have committed to so this would be sometime beginning, at least on our schedule right now, in the fall, or the latter part of '03, and I suspect we're looking at a six- to nine-month process modeled I believe, pretty much on how Eisenhower East went which I think from many people's perspective has been a good, has been a good process. Now, all of that is a land use plan for Eisenhower West that would eventually get incorporated into the master plan. That is different than what Rich and Tom and T&ES are undergoing which is a, I mean the way we have framed it, is a comprehensive, transportation policy and program, which is looking comprehensively across the board at every element of transportation, if you will. So it's, it's pedestrian safety. It's regulatory improvements. It's traffic calming. It's transit. It's roads. It's, it's everything. That is something that has been, kind of been put off for a little while because of Eisenhower/Duke, and we will get back into it after the, yeah, after the first of the year, and I would say that we have

a good 18 to 24? – 18 to 24 months left on wrapping that up. So, if the desire is to take, let me give my own opinion, if the desire is to have future consideration of the connector attached to something else, I would, my own view is to attach it to what is the next study activity in Eisenhower Valley which would be Eisenhower West and it will have a transportation component to it. And I would do it in that context, frankly, because it will be quicker. It's related right to Eisenhower Valley and land use decisions in Eisenhower Valley. That's my, that's my thought on that.

Mayor: Mr. Euille.

Euille: Yeah, Mr. Mayor. I appreciate Mr. Speck's motion and in making reference to the Comprehensive Integrated Transportation Solutions Action Plan which I presented. I highlighted conceptually last week at our work session, but I made it available to members of City Council and the staff early last week, late last week, rather. And the rationale for such an action plan is to, as I said, is to remove the connectors as a neighborhood issue but address, but allow this plan to address traffic concerns as a citywide, in a citywide, as a citywide issue in, in perspective and solution. And the, the plan would take into account protection of residential neighborhoods, pedestrian safety, reduction of traffic volume and congestion, encouragement of mass transit use and a study of arterial streets in key congestion points like Braddock Road, King Street, Quaker Lane and Duke. And also address public safety access to the Valley. What I'm, what I was hoping that we can gain from such a plan, and while I don't totally disagree with the city manager, is to be able to reach a compromise. I think we've gotten off base relative to really what we are trying to accomplish in terms of joint meeting addressing the traffic congestion in the Duke Street corridor by focusing primarily on a solution or one solution, namely, a connector solution. And I honestly believe that we ought to do this in, in a more holistic way, focusing on, on transportation, the transportation master plan and land use together. And I think we can do all of this, including whether or not we want to continue to proceed with the review and discussion of a two-lane connector, a two-lane road or any other traffic transportation traffic solutions, but I think what we all to make sure that we're, we're focusing on and are in agreement with, is having a plan that addresses every possibility that could exist and that we're, in, in taking into account those items that I've, I've highlighted, more importantly, I think what, really what this plan does is to provide a commitment to the solutions with a buy-in from the neighborhoods and certainly before, you know, we can do any of this, we, the Council, should we agree to move forward, need to be committed to providing the funds to allow this to, to happen.

Mayor: Ms. Pepper.

Pepper: Mr. Mayor. I have my own resolution which I have passed around to other members of council. Did everybody get a copy of that? And I don't know if it includes everything or maybe it just formalizes what you're saying here, and I'd just like to read it and get some response from the members of council. I understand that there's another motion on the floor. I would move that the City Council at this time table further discussion or consideration of any additional roads or streets connecting Eisenhower Avenue to Duke Street and request the city manager to suspend any further study or examination of such roads or streets. Further consideration of such roads or streets by staff as well as Council should be undertaken only as part of or after a coordinated master planning effort addressing land use and transportation issues in the Eisenhower West and related areas of the city. And I think that's pretty much what the manager is describing. Then, secondly, that City Council request the manager to initiate an immediate study of emergency service vehicle access to and from the Eisenhower Valley and present Council with interim as well as longer range recommendations for addressing any needed service improvement. Representatives from the fire, police and EMS departments should participate in this study. And what I'm saying in that is that instead of having some of the anecdotal kind of information that we've had, that at that point we really have some, some definite statistics or facts or feedback, that, that's actually been a study.

Cleveland: I thought we were having a discussion on the other, but I'll, you know, for the further, I'll second that to further –

Mayor: Did you make a formal motion? Is this a formal motion because I don't know that –

Pepper: Well, I think there's a motion on the floor.

Cleveland: There's already a motion on the floor.

Mayor: There is a motion on the floor and so, and, and, well, while Ms., Ms. Pepper could read the motion, I didn't hear her offer it as a, as a substitute.

Pepper: Well, what I'm saying – if I may? What he is saying, if I understand him correctly, is that he wants us to reaffirm what was in fact said at a session and that, that's something different than what I am proposing. And we can vote on what he has to say, and then I would like to propose mine as a motion.

Mayor: Well, actually, I would, actually, given the, the second paragraph of section one of your motion is, is virtually identical, I think, to what, to what Mr. Speck has, has put forward and, and other than the, the emergency vehicle, vehicle access, I, I don't find, find them particularly distinguishable because you –

Woodson: Public safety was part of it.

Pepper: Yeah. There is a difference between them.

Mayor: Well, I, I understand, and as I said a minute ago, the, I think the only really distinguishing part of this is, is the public safety aspect, and so, you know, I think my, my, the only concern I would have about, about the public safety access is unless we're talking about, it's fine to have a study, but unless we're talking about something that is, is number one, beyond the, the bike path that they're using now virtually on a daily basis, you know, I think we need to recognize right from the get-go that, that any connection, road, whatever, that, that relates to, to emergency, emergency service access is, is going to be funded solely by the city. You know, and I don't think we're, you know, given, given what we've heard at the Council retreat I don't think we're in the, in the position to be looking at yet again one more capital improvement program. I mean, you know, and I'll ask the question to, to Mr. Baier. I don't think the federal government or the state government is going to, going to construct a driveway for, for the, the public safety, for our police and fire.

Baier: Well, Mr. Mayor and Council, we did ask VDOT as well as FHWA and the wording exactly that they used, now this isn't to say that there won't be a letter that will come out that will, you know, be open-ended and blurry and whatever else, or clear, you know, but what was said was, it's doubtful. It's doubtful that state and federal funds can be used for a private roadway. They would not give it to us in writing until we actually had some plan. That's what they have said.

Pepper: Well, Mr. Mayor,

Mayor: Ms. Pepper.

Pepper: I wonder if they wouldn't do it, first of all this isn't just a private roadway. This is a roadway for emergency vehicles and that is a little different and I'm wondering if when you say they wouldn't do it without some kind of study or further information, that's what I'm asking for.

Mayor: Mr. Baier?

Baier: Well, what I can say is, is we asked for some examples of where they've done this before. And what they said is, is that citywide tax dollar, or citywide, statewide tax dollars and federal funds programmed as bridge and roadway dollars are normally used for, and I'm paraphrasing, are normally used for public roadways. When they said private roadways, what they're talking about is a roadway that excludes the general public, not necessarily a private roadway like to a

development or for just fire and police, but a roadway that excludes the general public.

Pepper: Well, if this is really a necessity as we've been hearing from the police department and you, yourself, Kerry, were saying that it was kind of disconcerting to see a police car facing you as you are on the bike path. If this really is a problem –

Mayor: Virtually daily.

Pepper: – then I think people would want to at least get started on a study to see just how serious that problem is. But, can we set that aside for a moment? I'd like to get back to what you were saying that you didn't see how number one differed from what David is suggesting, and I think it does in that he is really just, he's continuing the study here of two lanes.

Mayor: No, well, and, and quite frankly, your motion does the same. Your motion in paragraph three says further consideration of such roads or streets by staff as well as Council should be undertaken only as part of a coordinated master planning effort addressing land use and transportation issues in the Eisenhower West-related areas of the city. And I think that –

Pepper: But after the study is what I'm saying.

Mayor: Well, it says only as part of, as part of, your motion says, as part of or after a coordinated master plan, and, and if, unless I'm, I'm misinterpreting Mr. Speck and Mr. Euille, that's exactly what they, they have suggested.

Pepper: Well, let's say undertaken then after a coordinated planning, but you have to read paragraph two with paragraph one that says we literally table the discussion of a connecting road.

Mayor: And that's exactly, but that's exactly what Mr. Speck, Speck has proposed. And, and again –

Pepper: Is he tabling?

Mayor: Ms. Pepper, hold on. Your motion, which you haven't actually made, but your motion says further consideration of such roadway by staff as well as Council should be undertaken only as part of a coordinated master planning effort, which is exactly what Mr. Speck has, has outlined in his, in his motion. In fact, I would argue or posit that Mr. Speck's motion goes actually further than yours because his actually takes the, the four-lane options off the table and replaces them as, as two-lane options. Yours does not speak to, to that specific –

Pepper: I assumed we had already, our word is our bond, and at our work session we did affirm that we would be taking those off.

Mayor: That's not, that's not the point I'm making.

Pepper: And I think it is.

Mayor: But the point I'm making is, the point I'm making is that Mr. Speck, Mr. Speck's motion is much more specific than, than the one that you're offering. But at any rate, we do have a motion and a second on the, on the floor. Mr. Cleveland.

Cleveland: Mr. Mayor, I, I received Councilman Euille's white paper and, you know, I know he spent a lot of time on it and, you know, I read it and, you know, it goes directly to where we were going to. I asked in 2000 for a planning study, and we, we have a new planning director who came up with a plan for planning and we all went into that and it came to us just the last Council meeting when we were discussing with our planning director was asking us to include, I would say, the last vote that we took on the Mill Race into the Carlyle plan. It was a real plan for planning. But the end of, I say, Carlyle East, is not completed yet. That's what I would say. It has not been completed yet because there are a lot of things to be done in that to even get to Carlyle --

Mayor: Eisenhower.

Cleveland: -- to Eisenhower, to get to Eisenhower West. We're still in the planning process, and even in that vote, we went against our planning director asked us to do. We went against that. She, well, she asked us to include the, the Mill Race into the Carlyle design review plan because it would make it, they would make it so that it could be seen from all sides and that was a part of that plan. We haven't even completed that plan yet. And I, I agree with Councilman Euille, but when we have, we have a plan that is out there, we should stick to the plan, and we're not doing that.

Mayor: Well, and again, I, you know, I don't want to take issue with you, Mr. Cleveland, but, but I think you know if you would, would have heard what the manager said --

Cleveland: I heard what the manager said.

Mayor: He said that, that he envisions that the Eisenhower West would start late fall of 2003 and, and Mr. Speck's motion would put off any further consideration of, of a four-lane roadway would only permit further consideration of a two-lane roadway as part of that planning process.

Cleveland: I heard.

Mayor: And, and so, again, I, I see actually you agreeing, or at least in your comments I see you agreeing with Mr. Speck and his motion. I'm, I'm at a loss as to your explanation.

Cleveland: I, I know that you would be. You are at a loss at a lot of my explanations and a lot of things that I do, but I generally come out right.

Mayor: Okay.

Woodson: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor: Ms. Woodson.

Woodson: Thank you. I just have a quick question. I'm not exactly sure all of what, again, Councilman Speck's motion was so I will certainly ask for it to be restated before we vote on it, but when, when Mr. Sunderland began to speak, there was one thing that he said that, that I was a little concerned about and I think that tied in to some notes that I was making as Mr. Speck spoke which attached this to Eisenhower West. And my concern is that we not limit to attaching it to Eisenhower West but that the real need, and I think this was addressed in the white paper, but the real need is comprehensive. And what I don't want to see happen is, again, perhaps we've expanded it a little bit and at least in this case we are acknowledging that there is some connection between Eisenhower development and the need for this connector because that really hadn't been much a part of the discussion heretofore, or at least not the level that I think it should be because it is a primary component in the need or lack of a need for a connector. But I think as we discuss any of these changes, that we really must consider a comprehensive overview, and that would include not just what's going on in Eisenhower, but also what's going on in other parts of the city and what kind of an affect or impact a change to one might have in a ripple effect to another part of the city. Now, I know there's a great deal of consternation about the Braddock/King/Quaker intersection. Fears that if it's improved that will only increase the traffic. But quite frankly, that flies in the face of suggesting that traffic will not be increased with a connector from outside of the area, and if it's going to improve the flow of Alexandria traffic, well then that's a good thing. If it's actually increasing outside traffic, that's not what we said was going to happen, or at least that's not what we heard was going to happen because I of course never said that. So I just want to make certain that when I hear the motion again before we vote, because there's a couple of motions out here on the table, but, but that we conclude this by agreeing that it will not, whatever study is considered, will not be limited to Eisenhower West, but that all elements that

might have an impact by one, two or three connecting roads in a grid would have on the rest of the city.

Mayor: Mr. Speck, do you want to go ahead and, and restate your motion, and?

Eberwein: I have a ton of questions.

Mayor: Well, I'll tell you what, why don't we let him, since she's asked that it be restated, let's go ahead and have it restated.

Speck: Well, the motion is to make clear that what is, what is being removed from any further consideration are all four-lane options as well as the no-build with improvements as a package. What will be continued for additional study and analysis are two-lane roadway connections in multiple locations. Specific projects that were previously in the no-build with improvements that are deemed to be necessary for traffic improvement. Public safety access routes. And that staff report back to the Council with recommendations for undertaking a comprehensive transportation plan for the entire Eisenhower Valley, as reflected in the documents developed by Councilman Euille titled, "Comprehensive and Integrated Transportation Solutions Action Plan."

Pepper: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor: Okay, and that is, that is the motion. It's been seconded by Ms. Eberwein. Ms. Eberwein and then Ms. Pepper.

Eberwein: Actually, I think Mr. Euille seconded, Mr., I think we both seconded it but Mr. Euille got the credit for it. But, no, I'm, I'm addressing a, a couple of comments. I want to echo the comments of my colleagues in talking about looking at this in the context not just of Eisenhower West but of the valley and pretty much the entire length of, of Duke and Eisenhower because any kinds of roads, any kind of grid system we put in will affect not only Duke Street between Holland Lane and Van Dorn, but it will affect Duke Street and Old Town. Because there's no one that drives west on Duke Street during rush hour that isn't affected by the fact that none of the traffic can make use of the capacity that is on Eisenhower right now that is unused by traffic flowing east and west during rush hours. So, I intend to support this. I would not support this motion by Ms. Pepper. I have to be fairly blunt about the substitute motion on the floor and the attempt to after the fact –

Mayor: The substitute motion has never been made, but at any rate.

Eberwein: I thought there was a second to put it on the floor.

Mayor: The only motion that's on the floor right now is Mr. Speck's.

Eberwein: All right. Then I won't comment on this because to me this is a stop planning, stop staff, and how many years do we have to delay before we actually approach this from a comprehensive standpoint. And I see this as a stop mechanism, not an attempt to continue planning, and so I wholeheartedly support the motion on the floor.

Mayor: Ms. Pepper.

Pepper: Mr. Mayor, what I did not hear in Mr. Speck's motion was that we would table further discussion on the additional road connecting Eisenhower Avenue to Duke Street until after we have done this transportation plan. So I would like to offer this, mine, as, as an amendment and I'm going to change some of the words so that it does not include anything that would make it sound like we have a four-lane option here. The City Council at this time, this is what I'm going to move as a substitute motion. The City Council at this time should. I move that the City Council at this time table further discussions or consideration of any additional road connecting Eisenhower Avenue to Duke Street and request the city manager to suspend any further study or examination of such a road. And that would be two-lane at most. Further consideration of a two-lane roadway by staff as well as Council should be undertaken only after a coordinated master planning effort addressing land use and transportation issues in the Eisenhower West and related areas of the City – that gets into any, any place that, where one might be affected – and then I restate what I had before and that is, the City Council request the manager to initiate an immediate study of the emergency service vehicle access to and from the Eisenhower Valley and present Council with interim as well as long-range recommendations for addressing any needed service improvements. Representatives from the fire, police and EMS departments should participate in this study. That is my motion.

Mayor: Substitute motion made by Mrs. Pepper, seconded by Mr. Cleveland. Is there any further discussion?

Cleveland: Yes, Mr. Mayor, in light of us not having a public hearing and it seems to me that we are never going to have one, I'm, I'm seconding this motion because I've got to move on. We have really got to move on.

Mayor: I would agree. Motion by Mrs. Pepper, seconded by Mr. Cleveland. Is there any, this is in the form of a substitute. Ms. Eberwein.

Eberwein: If you listen to this motion, it says don't do anything. Master plan. Come up with a transportation plan but don't consider anything. Any potential connections between Eisenhower and Duke. That's what you're saying.

Pepper: Until we have completed –

Eberwein: How can they plan –

Pepper: – discussion –

Mayor: All right. One, one at a time.

Eberwein: You have removed options off the table. How can they possibly comprehensively plan when you have taken any option to plan off the table?

Pepper: If that is what the result of the transportation plan is, then we need to look at that and get into those –

Eberwein: Are you basically saying they should plan a transportation plan without looking at any connections?

Mayor: Wait. Wait. One at a time. Claire, Claire. One at a time.

Pepper: – re-examined with new numbers using the new model what a two-lane would be, and you wouldn't be doing that. You wouldn't run those figures and those numbers until after it was decided that such was needed. But what I am saying is this gets back to the whole discussion that we had at our work session where we were indicating that we really need to get that horse in front of the cart as opposed to behind.

Mayor: Okay. We have a substitute motion and a second. Is there any further discussion? All those in favor say aye. Well, we almost forgot to vote there, didn't you? All those opposed to the motion.

Speck: Aye.

Mayor: No, you say no.

Speck: No. Sorry, sorry.

?: No.

Mayor: The motion fails by a vote of two-to-five. We'll now return to consideration of the main motion on the floor which, quite frankly, I think we're mincing words here, but, you know, when you get right down to it, I think they effectively accomplish the same thing. We have a motion by Mr. Speck. It's been seconded by Mr. Euille. Is there any further discussion?

Pepper: Yes. Mr. Mayor, I would think that in, there is a difference between the two of them, and I understand that mine has already failed –

Mayor: That's right.

Pepper: But what I'm saying is the difference is that they are going to continue running the numbers on the two-lane connector.

Mayor: You know,

Pepper: Is that yes or no?

Mayor: You know, again, again, you know, I don't know how many times we have to say this, but, but Mr. Speck's motion says that that's only going to happen as part of a comprehensive plan, planning exercise set forth in Mr. Euille's white paper, and which to speaks to transportation and land use planning. And I, and I, again –

Pepper: It doesn't. His paper does not quite address that point.

Mayor: Well, I, maybe we'll just have to agree to disagree on that. We have a motion and a second. Is there any further discussion? Mr. Euille.

Euille: I think this discussion that we're having as members of Council is indicative of the, not only the frustration that we've all experienced in terms of trying to work out a solution relative to the congestion issue and, and development in Eisenhower Valley, but more importantly, the friction that, and the high degree of friction that has been endured by, has been endured by residents and citizens and the, through the e-mails and the, the phone calls and the meetings we've had, and this whole purpose with the white paper, so-called white paper that I've offered, is to put all those things aside, to, for us, you know, start anew and do this under, under a process or a format that certainly is, is one that allows us to look at, comprehensively, transportation and land use as we move forward to try to solve the, seek solutions to, to the problems, as to problems as has been highlight. But again, more importantly, if we're, which we, we have stated, that we're saying no to a four-lane connector, this body in terms of demonstrating leadership must have an exit strategy or backup plan, and I think this, the motion that's on the table

certainly affords us the, the proper venue to move forward and continue to work for a satisfactory resolution.

Mayor: Well, and I, and I certainly hope that there is a satisfactory resolution because, I mean, ultimately, ultimately, as part of the planning process, we've got to address the issue of, three issues that are sort of central to, to the whole debate and that's the issues of, of public safety access, it's the issues of connectivity with, with the rest of the city and it's the, the issue of, of relieving some of the congestion on Duke Street. To do nothing, to do nothing is basically saying the status quo is, is acceptable and that's why I think that, that, you know, we must look at, at solutions. You know, again I was talking with, with Ms. Woodson before the meeting tonight and we were sort of musing a little bit. There was a political, well actually a public administrator named Aaron Valdosky once said that, that a problem is a solution, or a problem is a, is an issue with solutions. If you don't accept the solutions, then your problem is no longer a problem, it's a condition, and it's a condition that, that you're willing to accept. If you're not willing to accept the solutions, then, then your problem is no longer a problem. Ms. Woodson and then we're going to vote on this thing.

Woodson: ??

Mayor: Okay. Is there any further discussion? All those in favor say aye?

Sunderland: Kerry, but, I, I have to get a clarification because I'm, I'm not clear. And since we're going to have to carry it out, I need to be clear. First of all. With respect to Mr. Euille's paper. I mean, it's a good paper. I, I've read it. That, that is something that we're, we're already doing, and he's added a couple of items. We will continue to do it. Second item. I understand the motion on the floor is to defer, or better yet, incorporate any further consideration of a connector. Let's make sure this is right. Not in connection with any Eisenhower West study but instead in connection with the comprehensive transportation look that we're doing. That, that's what I'm hearing. That's what I heard from, from Mr. Speck. All right. All right. Okay. And then what we do with Eisenhower West, which I said was, I'm, I don't know, well, I don't know what we're going to do. Going to have to, going to have to think what the proper timing for that small area plan effort is.

Woodson: Would Eisenhower West not be a part of a comprehensive approach? It's not going to be done in a vacuum. Right?

Eberwein: Mr. City Manger. I'm, I'm not sure you heard. You gave us a date for Eisenhower West. Then you gave us a separate date for a comprehensive plan that covered the entire city. I think it's someplace in between that. I mean I don't

think we're asking you to look at traffic planning in Del Ray as affecting this area. On the other hand, I think we're talking about having it be part of, certainly we don't want you to ignore it when you talk about Eisenhower West.

Sunderland: Well, that's, that's my point.

Eberwein: So, I, I think what we're talking about, Mr. Speck can correct me if I'm wrong, but something that's flexible that is looking at all, a broader area than just Eisenhower West but isn't necessarily meaning that you have to wait two years or whatever it is for them to do this sort of master transportation plan that covers the entire city. So I think it's flexible. I stop for Mr. Speck's comment.

Mayor: I think, I think consideration of the, the Eisenhower West has to, has to include at least some recognition or some provision of connectivity and --

Sunderland: No question. No question. So, all right. We, we will. All right. We will figure out what to do.

Pepper: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor: Mrs. Pepper.

Pepper: I guess the concern that I have and I don't see how I can vote for this is that I, I need to know is the, what does the consultant do tomorrow? He is geared up ready to start running the numbers and to prepare a report that'll be turned in to us either in December or January or sometime. Does our consultant --

Sunderland: The consultant's not going to do anything.

Mayor: No.

Pepper: Is he going to be running the numbers on a two-lane connector? He does not do that?

Mayor: No.

Baier: Mr. Mayor and Council. As I understand, we, we would not have any consultant work done. It would be done in concert with, as a part of, Eisenhower West giving due consideration to the comprehensive policy and program that we're going to roll out in January. Understanding that we have an existing transportation system that we're going to have to optimize as Mr. Euille sets out in his white paper.

Pepper: So, where does the two-lane study go in a timetable? I want you to be as precise as you can.

Mayor: Okay.

Sunderland: I, look, I don't think we know right now because you, I understand what you've asked us to do. We have a, and I understand exactly what Ms. Eberwein is saying. We are going to have to take the, an element of the comprehensive study and, frankly, pull it off, wind it in with Eisenhower, unless, wind it in with Eisenhower West and put the two of them together. I'm not sure how we're going to do that right now. Because I understand you're saying don't wait. You know. It's going to take us two years to do the comprehensive, and I understand your saying don't do that. Don't wait two years. Eisenhower West can be shorter term, but you want, and understandably, you want the connector kind of in the context of the overall transportation policy for the city, so we're, I'm going to have to think about how to get both goals done. But I understand the message which is, you can't land-use study Eisenhower West without having a position, comprehensively if you will, derived, comprehensively derived on the connector.

Pepper: And, and comprehensive always means land use planning too. I mean I don't want this to be, to be just the transportation. It'll always be with a big emphasis on the land use planning.

Mayor: Well, I think we've said it a couple of times, and that the land use elements are going to be included in this as part of the Eisenhower West as well as the comprehensive plan. How that gets folded together, I mean, we'll have to hear from, from the manager. But, this is but, but to answer your question specifically. Is the consultant going to be running numbers? No. No. It's over. That part's over.

Pepper: Okay.

Mayor: Okay? So, and so, you know, so, I guess maybe if you, I guess maybe if you vote against this motion, maybe you'll them to start running the numbers. Nope, nope, don't want to go there. We have a motion and a second. Is there any further discussion? All those in favor say aye; those opposed, no. Well, then I guess that motion carries unanimously.

Speck: Right. Sure sounded like it to me.

Mayor: That will be reported as a unanimous vote of the Council. We'll move on to other oral presentations.

Del Pepper

Ord(a)

11-12-02

Mr. Mayor, I move:

1. That City Council at this time table further discussion or consideration of any additional road ~~or streets~~ connecting Eisenhower Avenue to Duke Street and request the City Manager to suspend any further study or examination of such a road ~~or streets~~.

a 2 lane roadway
Further consideration of ~~such roads or streets~~ by staff as well as Council, should be undertaken only ~~as a part of~~ after a coordinated master planning effort addressing land use and transportation issues in the Eisenhower West and related areas of the City.

2. That City Council request the Manager to initiate an immediate study of emergency service vehicle access to and from the Eisenhower Valley, and present council with interim as well as longer range recommendations for addressing any needed service improvements. Representatives from the Fire, Police, and EMS Departments should participate in this study.

DPapper

Mr. Mayor, I move:

substitute Del / Cleve

1. That City Council at this time table further discussion or consideration of any additional roads ~~or streets~~ connecting Eisenhower Avenue to Duke Street and request the City Manager to suspend any further study or examination of such ~~roads or streets~~ .

a 2-lane way

Further consideration of ~~such roads or streets~~ by staff as well as Council, should be undertaken only as part of (or after) a coordinated master planning effort addressing land use and transportation issues in the Eisenhower West and related areas of the City.

2. That City Council request the Manager to initiate an immediate study of emergency service vehicle access to and from the Eisenhower Valley, and present council with interim as well as longer range recommendations for addressing any needed service improvements. Representatives from the Fire, Police, and EMS Departments should participate in this study.

Del / Cleve

2-5 fails

DRAFT VERBATIM

Oral Presentations, 11/12/02

(a) Mayor Donley stated that it was important for City Council to reaffirm the results of its Work Session on the Eisenhower to Duke Connector which were decided by consensus.

* * * * *

Councilman Speck moved to make it clear what is being removed from further consideration are all four-lane options as well as the no-build with improvements as a package. What we will continue for study and analysis are the two-lane roadway connections in multiple locations, specific projects that were previously in the no-build with improvements that are deemed to be necessary for traffic improvement, and public safety access routes. That staff report back to the Council with recommendations for undertaking [this study and analysis as part of the development of a revised small area plan for the western portion of Eisenhower Valley and] a comprehensive transportation plan for the entire Eisenhower Valley, as reflected in the documents developed by Councilman Euille, titled "Comprehensive and Integrated Transportation Solutions Action Plan." This motion was seconded by Councilman Euille and carried unanimously.

* * * * *

11/13/02:ss

Be
Feel this
need to
be the
mother,
Dinwiddie
of the
2nd
day
you run
6/1
Kerry
Pam
Pi

Councilman Speck moved to make it clear what is being removed from further consideration are all four-lane options as well as the no-build with improvements as a package. What we will continue for study and analysis are the two-lane roadway connections in multiple locations, specific projects that were previously in the no-build with improvements that are deemed to be necessary for traffic improvement, and public safety access routes. That staff report back to the Council with recommendations for undertaking a comprehensive transportation plan for the entire Eisenhower Valley, as reflected in the documents developed by Councilman Euille, titled Comprehensive and Integrated Transportation Solutions Action Plan. This motion was seconded by Councilman Euille and carried unanimously.

* * * * *

the no-build with
and public safety
for undertaking
reflected in the
and Integrated
uncilman Euille

*This study
and
analysis
is part of
the
Be
development
of a revised small
area
plan
for
the
western
portion of
Eisenhower
valley and*

to PGS/ME/RB

11/13/02 pm

DRAFT VERBATIM

Oral Presentations, 11/12/02

(a) Mayor Donley stated that it was important for City Council to reaffirm the results of its Work Session on the Eisenhower to Duke Connector which were decided by consensus.

* * * * *

Councilman Speck moved to make it clear what is being removed from further consideration are all four-lane options as well as the no-build with improvements as a package. What we will continue for study and analysis are the two-lane roadway connections in multiple locations, specific projects that were previously in the no-build with improvements that are deemed to be necessary for traffic improvement, and public safety access routes. That staff report back to the Council with recommendations for undertaking a comprehensive transportation plan for the entire Eisenhower Valley as reflected in the documents developed by Councilman Euille, titled Comprehensive and Integrated Transportation Solutions Action Plan. This motion was seconded by Councilman Euille and carried unanimously.

* * * * *

11/13/02:ss

"Verbatim" of Speck motions at CMO request:

* * *

Oral Presentations.

Mayor: One of the things that I want to, to bring up before the Council tonight is a, a reaffirmation of, of the results of our work session on the Eisenhower to Duke Connector, although I know you didn't want to, you don't want us to call it a connector any longer. We decided by, by consensus at that work session that we were going to remove the four-lane options from consideration. We would no longer consider four-lane options. That we would remove from consideration as a package, no-build with improvements. That we would only give any further consideration to two-lane options and we asked staff to look at potential multiple locations for those two-lane options. And then I know

the staff and the manager have been working on a scope of work and a time schedule as well. I think it's, since that decision that was arrived at by consensus in a work session, I think it's important that we reaffirm that decision tonight in an open and recorded vote and so Mr. Speck, I'd like to ask that you go ahead and offer that motion.

Speck: Mr. Mayor. Let me make a motion on several points. First, to make it clear what is being removed from further consideration that is all four-lane options as well as the no-build with improvements as a package. That we will continue for study and analysis the two-lane roadway connections at multiple locations. Specific projects that were previously in the no-build with improvements that are deemed to be necessary for traffic improvement. These are things that would continue to be considered. Public safety access routes. As well as that the staff report back to the Council with recommendations for undertaking a comprehensive transportation plan for the entire Eisenhower Valley as reflected in the documents developed by Councilman Euille entitled, Comprehensive and Integrated Transportation Solutions Action Plan. There may be some other things that we want to talk about but I think it's important to memorialize in a motion exactly what is not being considered and what is still part of our analysis and review.

Mayor: Let me just ask a question, a point of clarification. Well, let me say that we've done a motion. Is there a second to the motion? It's been seconded by Mr. Euille. Just a point of clarification on your motion, Mr. Speck. You made reference to a plan of action that has been offered by Mr. Euille that I believe has a couple of long-term elements and maybe I'll ask Mr. Euille to speak to it. (1) it would have a land use, or at least a planning element for West Eisenhower.

Speck: Yes.

Mayor: And also the completion of the transportation policy. And I know that the Manager has reviewed Mr. Euille's proposal as well. Just a quick question to the Manager. I know that a lot of that work has been ongoing and would be, this is obviously a more comprehensive look both at the land use and the transportation elements of not only the Eisenhower West

area but also the connectors, the two-lane roadways. Let me put it that way. How long do you believe that such a process would take and I'm assuming that what's envisioned is a similar process to what went on in the East Eisenhower area.

Manager: Let me distinguish between two things. One is a land use kind of small area study for Eisenhower West that would have a traffic transportation transit component to it just like Eisenhower East. So it would be looking at the development potential, the future of Eisenhower West and in defining what that future is there would be a transportation analysis done with it. That is something that is, as we have it scheduled now, is to begin, I think, sometime in the latter part of '03. Remember, we have Eisenhower East too and that's a planning and zoning arena, although obviously to the extent it's transportation, it involves T&ES as well. We have Eisenhower East scheduled to hopefully get wrapped up at the end of this year. We then have Mount Vernon Avenue we have committed to so this would be sometime beginning, at least on our schedule right now, in the fall, or the latter part of '03, and I suspect we're looking at a six- to nine-month process modeled I believe pretty much on how Eisenhower East went which I think from many people's perspective has been a good process. Now, all of that is a land use plan for Eisenhower West that would eventually get incorporated into the master plan. That is different than what Rich and Tom and T&ES are undergoing which is a comprehensive, I mean the way we have framed it, is a comprehensive transportation policy and program which is looking comprehensively across the board at every element of transportation, if you will. So it's pedestrian safety. It's regulatory improvements. It's traffic calming. It's transit. It's roads. It's everything. That is something that has been kind of been put off for a little while because of Eisenhower/Duke and we will get back into it after the first of the year and I would say that we have a good 18 to 24? 18 to 24 months left in wrapping that up. So, if the desire is to take, let me give my own opinion. If the desire is to have future consideration of the connector attached to something else, I would, my own view is to attach it to what is the next study activity in Eisenhower Valley which would be Eisenhower West and it will have a transportation component to it. And I would do it in that context, frankly, because it

will be quicker. It's related right to Eisenhower Valley and land use decisions in Eisenhower Valley. That's my thought on that.

Mayor: Mr. Euille.

* * *

Woodson: So, I just want to make certain that when I hear the motion again before we vote, because there's a couple of motions out here on the table, but that we conclude this by agreeing that it will not, whatever study is considered, will not be limited to Eisenhower West but that all elements that might have an impact by one, two or three connecting roads in a grid would have on the rest of the City.

Mayor: Mr. Speck, do you want to go ahead and restate your motion, and?

Eberwein: I have a ton of questions.

Mayor: Well, I'll tell you what, why don't we let him, since she's asked that it be restated, let's go ahead and have it restated.

Speck: Well, the motion is to make clear that is what is, what is being removed from any further consideration are all four-lane options as well as the no-build with improvements as a package. What will continued for additional study and analysis are two-lane roadway connections and multiple locations, specific projects that were previously in the no-build with improvements that are deemed to be necessary for traffic improvement. Public safety access routes. And that staff report back to the Council with recommendations for undertaking a comprehensive transportation plan for the entire Eisenhower Valley as reflected in the documents developed by Councilman Euille titled, Comprehensive and Integrated Transportation Solutions Action Plan.

Pepper: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor: Okay, that is, that is the motion that's been seconded by Ms. Eberwein. Ms. Eberwein and then Ms. Pepper.

Eberwein: Actually, I think Mr. Euille seconded Mr., I think we both seconded it but Mr. Euille got the credit for it. But, no, I'm addressing a couple of comments.

* * *

Eberwein: So, I intend to support this. I would not support this motion by Ms. Pepper. I have to be fairly blunt about the substitute on the floor and the attempt to after the fact -

Mayor: The substitute motion has never been made, but at any rate.

Eberwein: I thought there was a second to put it on the floor.

Mayor: The only motion that's on the floor right now is Mr. Speck's.

Eberwein: All right. Then I won't comment on this because to me this is a stop planning, stop staff and how many years do we have to delay before we actually approach this from a comprehensive standpoint, and I see this as a stop mechanism not an attempt to continue planning and so I wholeheartedly support the motion on the floor.

* * *

Mayor: Well, I think we've said it a couple of times, that the land use elements are going to be included in this as part of the Eisenhower West as well as the comprehensive plan. How that gets folded together, we'll have to hear from the Manager. But, to answer your question specifically. Is the consultant going to be running numbers? No. No. It's over. That part's over. Okay?

* * *

Mayor: We have a motion and a second. Is there any further discussion? All those in favor say aye; those opposed, no. Well, then I guess that motion carries unanimously. That will be reported as a unanimous vote of Council. We'll move on to other oral presentations.